

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 were pending in the present application when last examined. Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 remain pending.

§ 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 7 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,416,238 (“Gilliland et al.”). Addressing claim 1, the Examiner stated:

In Fig. 1, Gilliland discloses an optical assembly comprising a package (10) including an optoelectronic component; an alignment feature (20) mounted to a surface of the package; and a sleeve (30) defining only one bore (32) with an inner surface having a constant inner diameter for receiving and contacting outer surfaces of the alignment feature (20) and a ferrule of a fiber optic connector when the alignment feature and the ferrule are inserted into the bore at opposite ends of the bore so they can be aligned relative to each other (see Abstract).

October 11, 2006 Office Action, p. 2. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Fig. 1 of Gilliland et al. discloses an optoelectronic package 10 with an electrically conductive can 30 mounted to an electrically nonconductive substrate 40. See Gilliland et al., col. 4, lines 47 to 53; col. 5, lines 61 to 63. Can 30 includes an aperture 32 for receiving a transparent element 20. See Gilliland et al., col. 4, lines 60 to 66. Transparent element 20 provides a window in the otherwise opaque can 30 so that an optical diode 80 mounted on substrate 40 can emit light from package 10. As the Examiner can see, transparent element 20 and can 30 are part of package 10 and they cannot be an alignment feature mounted to package 10 and a sleeve receiving the alignment feature.

The Examiner cited the Abstract for disclosing that a ferrule of a fiber optic connector is inserted into aperture 32 of can 30. However, the Abstract is clearly referring to an array 1300 illustrated in Figs. 20 to 39. The Abstract describes a “device or array of arrayed optical subassemblies [that] includes modular units called on channel sub-assemblies.” Gilliland et al., Abstract. The Detailed Description provides that “FIGS. 20-39 ... [illustrate] a modular, high-density, multiple optical transmitter/receiver array 1300.” Thus, the Abstract is referring to array 1300 illustrated in Figs. 20 to 39 that has optical coupling elements 1325 with a ferrule receiving bore 1327. See Gilliland et al., col. 13, lines 49 to 61; col. 14, lines 37 to 39; col. 15, lines 58 to 63. Applicant notes that array 1300 does not include an alignment feature mounted to a package and a sleeve receiving the alignment feature and a ferrule of a fiber optic connector.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Gilliland et al.

Claims 4, 8, and 9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 2 recites similar limitations as claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 7 depends from claim 2 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 2.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilliland et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,540,412 (“Yonemura et al.”).

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gilliland et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,747 (“Irie et al.”).

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Summary

In summary, claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 were pending in the present application when last examined. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 9. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

Respectfully submitted,

/David C Hsia/

David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235

Patent Law Group LLP
2635 North First St., Ste. 223
San Jose, California 95134
408-382-0480x206